

Date: Fri, 5 Aug 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #354
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 5 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 354

Today's Topics:

What is wrong with ham radio

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 03 Aug 1994 19:06:42 GMT
From: newsserver.jvnc.net!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <31m6kv\$a73@news.iastate.edu>, twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu
(twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu) writes:
>In article <450@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:
>>So, you do think it should become easier to get a codeless license? Should, or
>>should not, the hours spent learning the code be used instead in
>>acquiring other ham-radio-related knowledge? Since being proficient at
>>the code ***is*** knowledge (although not of the kind you think valuable),
>>if you just toss the code and don't increase the difficulty of the
>>remaining testing, you are requiring less knowledge to get a license.
>>Just tell us if you are for or against this (and use small words so I
>>can understand).
>
>I have yet to see anyone promote requiring less knowledge, just not code.
>
>The argument is with requiring "work," not knowledge. There is a

>difference. We can easily judge the knowledge required for a license,
>but the work will always vary from one person to another. Some people
>don't have to work for any license, while others must struggle for each
>exam.

>

You're just pettifogging here. The work done **and** the knowledge possessed among a group of people passing any of our license tests will vary considerably. What I want to know is, if we reduce or eliminate the code requirement, are we going to keep the writtens as they are (resulting in a decrease in effort/knowledge/skill required to get a license), or are we going to increase the other requirements to roughly balance the effort/knowledge/skill needed to get a license. It's a simple question, really.

BTW, please give an example of someone who didn't have to work for their Extra.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Thu, 4 Aug 1994 22:55:25 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.2697.2427@channel1.com>, <wyn.88.2E3E409B@ornl.gov>, <Ctx9Jp.6AH@news.Hawaii.Edu>n.a
Subject : It's a law! or, civics 101

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:
: alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky) writes:

: >Its a treety, not a law... a treeety...oh foret it. Oy vey...
: >We give billions and billions of bullions to half the countries in the
: >ITU.

: A treaty huh? Is this treaty between the examinee and the VE? What
: happens if the VE breaks this 'treaty' and gives the examinee a
: passing score on the code test (when in fact the examinee fails the
: test); if the VE only breaks a 'treaty' why would he receive a big fine
: and possibly jail time if he gets caught?

: Al, if it's in the U.S. CFR's, then it's a **law**.

A more direct route to the result:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be

made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land ..." - Art. VI, Sec. 2

If it's a treaty, then it's a law - CFR or no CFR. (One of the objections I heard raised against NAFTA is that it overturns so many laws without even getting the approval of the House of Representatives, the body which theoretically at least represents the people. Of course, you could only fix this by amending the Constitution or forgoing treaties entirely.)

-drt

|David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com|

Date: Fri, 05 Aug 1994 07:59:11 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!swiss.ans.net!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <437@ted.win.net>, <31jnb3\$cu0@chnews.intel.com>, <442@ted.win.net><31p9j1\$7hk@chnews.intel.com>
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
Subject : Re: Tests to easy? Ok. Change what?

In article <31p9j1\$7hk@chnews.intel.com>, Jim Bromley, W5GYJ
(jbromley@sedona.intel.com) writes:

>>> I wrote:
>
>>>There is a great deal of merit in Kevin's suggestion. It focuses on
>>>expertise required for the operating mode. It really isn't exclusive;
>>>anyone can get the endorsement if they have the expertise. And there
>>>is also a precedent - the Radar Endorsement for commercial licenses.
>>>If you don't have to work on radar, you don't need it. If you do,
>>>then they want you to know what you are doing. Same thing with
>>>Amateur Radio in the 21st Century. You have to know what you are
>>>doing before you do it. That is the basic reason for requiring
>>>operator licensing. I think it only fair to the other mode users that
>>>a reasonable competency be attained in the desired mode before
>>>operation is commenced.
>
>>In article <442@ted.win.net>, Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:
>

stuff deleted

>

Let me just ask what are the problems that this micro-testing is trying to solve? Are hams really creating bedlam when they try a new mode? If they are (and I don't believe it), then let's include more questions on all the common modes in the written. It will give new and upgrading hams something useful to do with all those hours they'll save by not having to work on their code :)

I am still strongly against this idea.

73,

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 04 Aug 1994 16:33:42 GMT

From: koriel!male.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews1.Eng.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!
usenet@RUTGERS.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3113tg\$03m@crl4.crl.com>, <424@ted.win.net>,
<RFM.94Aug3183249@urth.eng.sun.com>ers
Subject : Re: License terms and memorizing the pool

In article <1994Aug4.114152.583@brtph560.bnR.ca> jwittich@b4pph107.bnR.ca (Jeffrey Wittich) writes:

>In article <RFM.94Aug3183249@urth.eng.sun.com>, rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:
>>590 questions! [in the Tech question pool]
>
>Hmm, I count 294. Are you including the Novice pool?

No, I was making a systematic measurement error, I was counting the question ids (with grep '^T[0-9][A-Z][0-9]' | wc -l) and every question got counted twice, because of the answers at the end. The more accurate way to count is:

grep -h '^T[0-9][A-Z][0-9]' tech-?.new | cut -d' ' -f1 | sort -u | wc -l

Now I get 295 (half of 590.) Still a lot, but adding another hundred now sounds meaningful.

>And yes, many

>people are memorizing many questions. Maybe not the Ohms law Q & As
>but most of the rules. Is there a better way to learn the material

>about what privs are allowed on what freqs?

Certainly I don't see any other way than memorization for that. I assume the people carping about "everybody just memorizes the answers" don't mean those questions. (Actually, I think it's kind of dumb to make people ***memorize*** that, a standard band-edge "crib sheet" ought to be provided.) After all, memorizing the band edges didn't prevent me from getting overly excited and working somebody in the Extra band during Field Day -- I didn't even notice till I went to write it in the log...

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: Wed, 03 Aug 1994 19:42:32 GMT

From: newsserver.jvnc.net!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!

swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@RUTGERS.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <424@ted.win.net>,

<Anthony_Pelliccio-260794113504@adis-204.adis.brown.edu>,

<lenwink.132.00087A34@indirect.com><072994173653Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <452@ted.win.net><31m702\$a73@news.iastate.edu>

Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)

Subject : Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

In article <31m702\$a73@news.iastate.edu>, twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu

(twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu) writes:

>In article <452@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>>In the past a

>>General or equivalent has always been the minimum permanent license

>>(and even that used to require proof of activity to renew).

>

>Not true--at least not in the recent past prior to the present-day

>Technician class. Don't forget Novice and Technician class licenses

>were permanent before 1990, and General and higher classes have not required

>proof of activity to renew for some time.

>

Alright, I'll be more precise. Since this is not an argument about CW,

I consider the old Tech to be equivalent to the General. The General or

equivalent ***written*** has always been the minimum required for a

permanent license, until the Novice went permanent and the new Tech

(coded and codeless) appeared. The Novice is to me a special case,

because its privileges are so restricted. Making it permanent was, I

think, a bean计数 decision, not a philosophical shift. With the

Tech, though, we do have a philosophical shift about what is required of a "mainstream" ham (no slight to Novices. I was one, and I talk to them all the time on HF). We didn't need to lower our *written* requirements to create a no-code license, and I think it was a mistake to do so. I'm suggesting the modest correction of limiting the Tech license to five years, after which anyone interested in the hobby could upgrade to a higher coded or no-code license. Do you really think there are people who could not pass the General written after five years, and if so, why do we want them in the hobby?

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Fri, 05 Aug 1994 07:46:29 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!swiss.ans.net!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jim-210794142336@jimsma<435@ted.win.net>,
<31h4m8\$7q2@chnews.intel.com>, <454@ted.win.net><31p3e2\$174@chnews.intel.com>
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <31p3e2\$174@chnews.intel.com>, Jim Bromley, W5GYJ
(jbromley@sedona.intel.com) writes:
>In article <454@ted.win.net>, Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:
>
>
>> ... Is there any
>> *intrinsic* difference between 13wpm and 5wpm, and can't every argument
>> against 13wpm be used against 5wpm? I need someone to explain to me
>> why one is unacceptable and the other is acceptable. If we have
>> 5wpm, what is to prevent this same fight from springing up all over
>> again in a few years. Why, from your point of view, should a hotshot
>> RF gunslinger have to learn 5wpm, any more than he should have to learn
>> 13? I know if I were arguing the other side, I couldn't accept 5/13ths
>> of a dead mode.
>
>There is a well-known "plateau" at 10 wpm. Most people are able to
>change their auditory/mental gears, start hearing words instead of
>letters, and progress. Others, like me, who can't do that, remain
>technician-class amateurs for the rest of their lives. I achieved 5
>wpm in a matter of weeks. I am yet to copy 13 wpm without an error
>every few letters. Fortunately, I was able to get an accomodation
>from the VEC (under threat of a medical waiver) and substitute a
>sending test.

>
>There is a world of difference between 5 wpm and 13 wpm. Or between
>10 wpm and 13 wpm.
>
Yes, it's true that many people hit a plateau around 10 wpm. However,
until your post I have *never* heard it used as an argument to require
less than 13wpm for general (small-g) HF privileges. That isn't to
say you *can't* make that argument, just that I haven't seen it surface
here before. What I'm asking is how any of the regular arguments
against the current code requirements (and we all know them by now)
can logically reject 13wpm and accept 5, as some posts, to my surprise,
seem to attempt.

73,
Mike, KK6GM

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #354
